APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/838,578	04/20/2001	Alexander Aptus	300136300016	9138

			EXAMINER
23485	7590	05/05/2004	TANG, KUO LIANG J

JINAN GLASGOW
P O BOX 28539
RALEIGH, NC 276118539

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2122	

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _20 April 2001_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-14_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-14_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _4_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to the application filed on 04/20/2001.

Claims 1-14 are pending and have been examined. The priority date for this application is

04/21/2000.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on
> sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2.   Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Suzuki et

al., "Managing the software design documents with XML", Proceedings of the 16th annual

international conference on Computer documentation, September 1998 (hereinafter Suzuki).

As Per Claim 1, Suzuki teaches that interested in a distributed model management system

that manages the software design documents over the Internet with UXF. This system leverages

the team development, reuse of design documents and tool interoperability by publishing a set of

CORBA interfaces. (E.g. see Abstract and associated text). In that Suzuki discloses the method

that covering the steps of:

"generating textual documentation that describes the source code, the textual

documentation having portions that correspond to portions of the source code" (E.g. see page

132, left side of Figure 2 and associated text);

"generating a diagram including diagram elements that visually represent the portions of

source code;" (E.g. see page 132, right side of Figure 2 and associated text) and

"correlating the diagram elements to the corresponding portions of the textual

documentation." (E.g. see page 132, Figure 2 and associated text, e.g. MODEL)

As Per Claim 4, is the system claim corresponding to the method claim 1 and is rejected

under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 1.

As Per Claim 5, is the computer-readable medium claim corresponding to the method

claim 1 and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 1.

As Per Claim 8, Suzuki teaches

"a secondary storage device (E.g. see page 127, right column, lines 7-8) containing a

software project (E.g. see page 134, right column, line 27), the software project comprising

source code;"

"a memory (E.g. see page 133, right column, line 25) comprising a software development

tool that generates documentation that describes the source code (E.g. see page 132, left side of

Figure 2 and associated text), the documentation including a diagram portion (E.g. see page 132,

right side of Figure 2 and associated text) and a text portion (E.g. see page 132, left side of

Figure 2 and associated text) and having links between the diagram portion and the text

portion(E.g. see page 132, Figure 2 and associated text);" and

"a processor for running the software development tool." A processor is inherent

otherwise all the processes can not be processed and the program will be halt.

As Per Claim 9, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Suzuki teaches

"wherein the documentation is hypertext markup language (HTML) documentation(E.g.

see page 129, right column, lines 52-56) displayable by a web browser (E.g. see page 129, lines

32-35)".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 2-3, 6-7, and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Suzuki in view of Chao et al., US Patent No. 6,711,299 (hereinafter Chao).

As Per Claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Suzuki teaches embed

hypermedia links (E.g. see page 129, right column, lines 53-58) and images like GIF or JPEG are

included within a HTML text stream (E.g. see page 129, left column, lines 2-5).   Suzuki does

not explicitly disclose generating HTML hyperlink references (E.g. see col. 26:38) from the

diagram elements to the corresponding portions of the textual documentation. However Chao, in

analogous art, teaches "wherein the step of correlating includes generating HTML hyperlink

references" (E.g. see col. 26:38) from the diagram elements to the corresponding portions of the

textual documentation." (E.g. see col. 26:35-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Chao

into the system of Suzuki, by generating HTML hyperlink references from the diagram elements

to the corresponding portions of the textual documentation. The modification would have been

obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated for user to select

from the image map and display the corresponding source code.

As Per Claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Suzuki teaches embed

hypermedia links (E.g. see page 129, right column, lines 53-58) and images like GIF or JPEG are

included within a HTML text stream (E.g. see page 129, left column, lines 2-5). Suzuki does

not explicitly disclose generating a diagram includes generating an image map for an image of

the diagram. However Chao, in analogous art, teaches "generating a diagram includes generating

an image map for an image of the diagram." (E.g. see col. 26:35-44). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate

the teaching of Chao into the system of Suzuki, by generating a diagram includes generating an

image map for an image of the diagram. The modification would have been obvious because

one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated for user to select from the image map

and display the corresponding source code.

As Per Claim 6, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and is rejected under the same

reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 2.

As Per Claim 7, the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 3. Further, Suzuki teaches GIF image (E.g. see page 129, left column, lines 2-5).

As Per Claim 10, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 2.

As Per Claim 11, Suzuki teaches

"generating textual documentation that describes the source code;" (E.g. see page 132, left side of Figure 2 and associated text);

"generating images corresponding to the diagram that are displayable by an application;" (E.g. see page 132, right side of Figure 2 and associated text);

Suzuki does not explicitly disclose mapping the images into regions; and generating hyperlink references from the regions to the textual documentation. However Chao, in analogous art, teaches "mapping the images into regions; and generating hyperlink references from the regions to the textual documentation" (E.g. see col. 26:35-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Chao into the system of Suzuki, by mapping the images into regions; and generating hyperlink references from the regions to the textual documentation. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated for user to select from the image map and display the corresponding source code.

As Per Claim 12, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated and further Suzuki teaches

"generating hypertext markup language (HTML) documentation" (E.g. see page 129,

right column, lines 52-56).

As Per Claim 13, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated and is rejected under the same

reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 9. Further, Suzuki teaches GIF image

(E.g. see page 129, left column, lines 2-5).

As Per Claim 14, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated and further Suzuki teaches

"wherein the step of mapping the images comprising mapping the images into rectangular

regions." (E.g. see page 133, right side of Figure 2 and 5 and associated text).

Conclusion

4.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuo-Liang J Tang whose telephone number is 703-305-4866. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q Dam can be reached on 703-305-4552.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306.

Kuo-Liang J. Tang

Software Engineer Patent Examiner

ANTONY NGUYEN-BA
PRIMARY EXAMINER